P-5512

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application and consideration of the remarks are respectfully requested. Claims 1 to 20 are currently pending, claim 6 has been canceled, and claim 1 has been amended.

The Office Action mailed January 13, 2004 addressed claims 1 to 20. Claims 1 to 5 and 7 to 20 were rejected, and claim 6 was allowed.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 6, which was allowed, and claim 6 was canceled. Claims 2 to 5 and 7 to 10 depend, or ultimately depend, from amended claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 to 5 and 7 to 10 are allowable.

Claims 1 to 5 and 7 to 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sullivan et al. (5,984,806). The Examiner rejected the claims for various reasons.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner and submits that the Examiner has not made out a *prima facie* case of obviousness. As previously discussed, claim 1 was amended to incorporate the limitation of claim 6, which was allowed. Claims 2 to 5 and 7 to 10 depend from claim 1, therefore Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2 to 5 and 7 to 10 are also allowable.

Regarding claim 11, Applicant respectfully submits that Sullivan does not disclose at least one hollow channel extending around the longitudinal axis of the core perpendicular to the ball's spin axis and at least one high-density region disposed in said hollow channel. Sullivan discloses a golf ball having an inner cover that includes a high-density region, such as that shown in Figure 8. Applicant respectfully submits that the high-density region is not disposed in a hollow channel, as required by Applicant's claim 11. Instead, Sullivan discloses that "the pattern is molded with the mantle layer such that the pattern extends radially outward to the final radius of the ball", and not inward in a channel. Claims 12 to 18 depend from claim 11, therefore Applicant respectfully submits that claims 12 to 18 are also not obvious over Sullivan for the same reasons.

Regarding claim 19, Applicant respectfully submits that the claim requires "a core having a high density region interiorly disposed within the extension perimeter of the core". Applicant respectfully submits that contrary to the Examiner's assertions, Sullivan does not disclose a high density region as claimed by Applicant. As stated by the Examiner, the golf ball of Sullivan has a high-density region in the inner cover layer. Claim 20 depends from claim 19, therefore Applicant respectfully submits that claim 20 is also not obvious over Sullivan.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 to 5 and 7 to 20 are not obvious over Sullivan. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1 to 5 and 7 to 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 1, 11 to 13, 16, 18 and 19 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 9 and 16 of U.S. Patent No. 6,261,193.

Although Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner, in an effort to hasten prosecution, Applicant herein submits a Terminal Disclaimer which disclaims the terminal portion of any patent granting from the instant applications, as required under MPEP § 1490.

The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney if it is deemed that a telephone conversation will hasten prosecution of the application.

## **CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of each of the presently objected and rejected claims, claims 1 to 5 and 7 to 20. Applicant respectfully requests allowance of claims 1 to 5 and 7 to 20, the claims currently pending.

Respectfully submitted,

R. DENNIS NESBITT

Customer No.

Phone: (413) 322-2937

Michelle Bugbee, Reg. No

Attorney for Applicant

The Top-Flite Golf Company

A wholly-owned subsidiary of Callaway Golf Company

425 Meadow Street

P.O. Box 901

Chicopee, MA 01021-0901

Cc: Richard M. Klein, Esq. (SLDZ 2 00274)

2004